

August 22, 2016

Clark County School District Board Statement

On Friday, August 19, 2016 at 5 p.m., District staff was provided updated draft regulation regarding the Clark County School District reorganization to be presented at the Nevada Department of Education (NDOE) Regulation Workshop today Monday, August 22, 2016. As a result, the District only has had over the weekend to review the revised draft regulation. The Clark County School District Board of Trustees has had no opportunity to meet and discuss the regulation as a Board prior to the meeting today. The Board does not meet again until August 25, 2016 three days after this meeting today.

You should be aware that the Board was provided an updated version of the draft regulation from the Legislative Committee to Reorganize the Clark County School District on August 11, 2016. The District reviewed the regulation prior to the Advisory Legislative Committee meeting on August 16, 2016. At that meeting, a Board representative made public comment that the Board's position that the draft regulation still does not resolve some of the Board's concerns regarding student achievement, equitable funding, student equity, and legal, financial and employment issues. I am providing for the record a copy of the August 16, 2016 Board statement and a document that sets forth concerns regarding the draft regulation dated August 11, 2016, and copies of the Board motions regarding the AB394 process from previous Board meetings on August 3, 2016 and August 11, 2016.

The Board continues to be concerned that this process of developing the regulation has proceeded too quickly to allow for careful review and consideration of the practical implications this process will have on students, the climate at the schools and the operation of the schools and the organization going forward.

Several examples of concerns with the Legislative Committee's proposed regulation include:

- Continued lack of focus on student achievement, which is a primary strategic imperative of this Board and NDOE.
- The regulation as drafted is inconsistent and conflicts with numerous state laws and the legal authority given to the Board of Trustees and the District.
- The Regulation as drafted conflicts with the policies and regulations of this Board which serve to provide direction and continuity within the district's organization.
- Lack of inclusion and assurance that statutory purchasing laws and CCSD procurement policies will be considered and incorporated in the regulation.
- The Board is concerned about the financial impact of this proposed regulation.

- It raises a question whether a principal should encourage and motivate teachers to participate in professional growth plans, knowing that it will make the teachers more expensive and therefore divert resources from other programs.
- Lack of understanding and importance of ongoing student equity issues including assurances in the regulation that equity will be maintained at the local school precinct when there is no clear central service oversight of student assignment, school attendance boundaries, zone variances, school siting, increasing seats at individual schools, and determining capacity and facility utilization of each school, as well as, the failure to delineate checks and balances that will ensure that all students will have equitable access to high quality programs including advanced placement programs, honors, gifted programming, etc.
- No clear provisions to ensure that equity and diversity in hiring, promotion and retention of employees will be paramount at the local school precinct as well as within central services.
- Concerns regarding the development of a weighted student formula without consideration of benchmarks from other school districts who have implemented these formulas or consideration of experts who advise in this area nationally, and without adequate funding provided by the State to pay for these needs, as well as, concern that the State has not given the District extra money for the weighted formula, so giving the current money available to the district toward the weights will potentially take money away from general education students.
- Ensuring that there are provisions for district wide continuity, consistent implementation and compliance with state and federal laws including Title I, II, III, VI, IX, and IDEA and 504.

The Board appreciates the opportunity to voice these concerns and will continue to provide comments regarding the proposed regulation to the Nevada Department of Education and the Nevada State Board of Education in order to ensure that the regulation improves education for all students in the Clark County School District.

August 16, 2016

Clark County School District Board Statement

The Board's position, as stated at the August 11, 2016 meeting, is that, while some progress is being made as the regulation is being updated, there continue to be legal issues that remain.

We want to thank the Committee for allowing us to participate in discussions regarding this regulation and for making some modifications to address some of the District's concerns. We greatly appreciate their time and effort working with us on these changes.

We were provided the latest version of the draft regulation from the Legislative Committee to Reorganize the Clark County School District on August 11, 2016. Having reviewed the regulation since then we believe that this draft does not resolve our concerns regarding student achievement, equitable funding issues, student equity concerns, financial and employment issues. I am providing a document that sets forth the district's concerns regarding these regulations.

The Board is concerned that this process of developing the regulation has proceeded too quickly to allow for careful review and consideration of the practical implications this process will have on the school district and the operation of the schools and the organization going forward.

Several examples of concerns with the Legislative Committee's proposed regulation include:

- Continued lack of focus on student achievement, which is a primary strategic imperative of this Board and should be with this Legislative Committee;
- Lack of inclusion and assurance that statutory purchasing laws and CCSD procurement policies will be considered and incorporated in the regulation;
- Until the public has the results of the Advisory Committee's financial impact analysis/study of the district required by the Legislature in AB394, Section 25(1)(b), the Board is concerned about the financial impact of this proposed regulation;
- It raises a question whether a principal should encourage and motivate teachers to participate in professional growth plans, knowing that it will make the teachers more expensive and therefore divert resources from other programs;
- Lack of understanding and importance of ongoing student equity issues including assurances in the regulation that equity will be maintained at the local school precinct when there is no clear central service oversight of student assignment, school attendance boundaries, zone variances, school siting, increasing seats at individual schools, and determining capacity and facility utilization of each school, as well as, the failure to delineate checks and balances that will ensure that all students will have equitable access to high quality programs including advanced placement programs, honors, gifted programming, etc.;

- No clear provisions to ensure that equity and diversity in hiring, promotion and retention of employees will be paramount at the local school precinct as well as within central services;
- Concerns regarding the development of a weighted student formula without consideration of benchmarks from other school districts who have implemented these formulas or consideration of experts who advise in this area nationally, and without adequate funding provided by the State to pay for these needs, as well as, concern that the State has not given the District extra money for the weighted formula, so giving the current money available to the district toward the weights will potentially take money away from general education students; and
- Ensuring that there are provisions for district wide continuity, consistent implementation and compliance with state and federal laws including Title I, II, III, VI, IX, and IDEA and 504.

The Board appreciates the opportunity to voice these concerns along with consideration of the comments to the proposed regulation in order to ensure that the regulation improves education for all students in the CCSD.

Clark County School District
Responses to Draft Regulation to Reorganize the Clark County School District (Revised on 8/11/2016)

08-16-2016

09:54:27 a.m.

STATE OF NV

7024863962

8/16/2016

1	1	2	"as used in sections 2 to 32..."	Update the numbering to include sections 33, 34, and 35.	
2	1	2	"unless the context otherwise requires"	Change to "unless other state laws and regulations require,"	
3	1	4	"Central Services" means the administrative staff..."	Change the language to state "means the functions and services of the Clark County School District that provide services to the schools."	Throughout the regulations, "Central Services" is used to refer to functions and services, not employees.
4	1	5	"Any other information declared by law..."	Change 5.2 to "...by Federal and State law..."	
5	1	7	"pursuant to Section 13 of this regulation"	Change to "Section 13.1 of this regulation."	
6	1	8	"pursuant to section 30 of this regulation."	Change to "pursuant to section 23.3 of this regulation and which is approved pursuant to section 30 of this regulation."	
7	2	13.1	"A charter school or university school for profoundly gifted pupils..."	Strike "or university school for profoundly gifted pupils"	No such schools exist in Clark County.
8	3	13.4(b)		Add "or change or modify the program of instruction at a specialty school without approval by the Superintendent."	
9	3	14.1	"The Superintendent shall transfer responsibilities..."	Modify to "the Superintendent shall delegate responsibilities..."	
10	3	14.2(e)	"Selecting the staff for the local school principal..."	Modify to "Selecting the staff for the local school precinct from a list of qualified applicants, consistent with Nevada law..."	
11	3	14.2 (c)			How does this impact purchasing requirements in NRS regarding bidding for items over \$50,000? At the school level, a purchase may be less than \$50,000, but in aggregate for the District may be greater.
12	3	14.2(c)			It is important that Chapter 332 not be changed in order to continue the checks and balances it provides for the contracting process.
13	3	14.2 (c)	"...as it deems..."	Modify to "...as the principal deems..."	
14	3	14.2 (c)	"Procure such equipment..."	Modify to "Procure, consistent with state and federal law, such equipment..."	

<p>15 4 14.3</p> <p>Add: (m) Developing enrollment projections for the district and for each local school precinct; (n) Drawing and redrawing attendance zones; developing, implementing, and monitoring specialty schools/programs; (o) Implementing and monitoring of zone variances; (p) Determining where and when to site new schools; (q) Determining when to open a new school, determining when to close and existing schools, and when to add seats to an existing school</p>	<p>16 4 14.3</p> <p>(r) Ensuring implementation of and compliance with all state and federal laws including Title I, II, III, VI, IX, and IDEA and 504. (s) Provision and placement of programs pursuant to IDEA. (t) Determining capacity and facility utilization of each building.</p>	<p>17 4 14.3 (e)</p> <p>"Services to promote and ensure equity and diversity" Add "so that all students no matter where they attend school receive equitable access to high quality programs, such as AP, honors, gifted, etc."</p>	<p>18 4 14.3(b) through 14.3(i)</p> <p>14.6 appears to address support staff concerns regarding outsourcing in 14.4. It is also unclear how pay-for-service will affect budgeting for positions. If schools do not "sign up" for services in their budget, those functions may have to cut staff due to lack of funds. Then if schools want those functions, vacancies must be filled. This could be very disruptive.</p>	<p>19 4 14.3(f)</p> <p>"Qualifying employees for any position within the school district" Modify to "providing human resources functions to support each local school precinct, including recruitment of new employees, support to ensure equity and diversity in the hiring, promotion and retention of all employees in the District and in each local precinct and ensure evaluation of employees."</p>
--	---	---	---	--

20	5	14.5	"...select teachers who are..."	Add "...select teachers, pursuant to section 14.2(a)(3), who are..."
21	5	14.5	Substantive "To the greatest extent possible," a principal shall select licensed teachers before selecting substitutes	This language makes the language seem optional. It needs to be mandatory. Delete the referenced opening and just start the sentence with "The..." School budget pressures may push a school organizational team to consider hiring a long-term substitute when licensed teachers are available. In addition, the hiring of licensed teachers rather than substitutes is consistent with Senator Roberson's message. This language would also address the problem of having teachers whom principals won't hire and who cannot be placed in Central Office under the new system.
22	5	14.6	Clarify the terms "necessary maintenance or repair," "timely manner," "other necessary action."	This section mandates that service be provided without consideration of financial ability and who will pay the bill if extra costs are incurred by not using District employees, and driven/impacted by state procurement statutes. Cost impact concerns arise.
23	6	14.7	Entire subsection	Replace with "On or before January 15 of each year, the Superintendent shall determine, in consultation with the principals and school associate superintendents of each local school precinct and with the approval of the Board of School Trustees, whether any central office service or function in subsection 13.3 that do not effect the civil rights obligations of the District or students may be delegated to a local school precinct. If additional responsibilities are delegated to a local school precinct, the Superintendent must allocate additional money to local school precincts via the weighted student formula and the local school precinct must include the costs for these responsibilities in the school budget."

8/16/2016

<p>24 7 15.1(b)</p> <p>The first sentence speaks to services, etc., the schools can "obtain" from the District or elsewhere</p> <p>Recommend the word be changed here, and throughout the document to "purchase"</p> <p>There will be a cost for every function/service provided that is not covered under the rubric of the items that remained central. While central services will be totally focused on enabling success at the schools, the schools will be responsible for paying for planned and unplanned consequences of their actions as central's funds will be reduced.</p>	<p>25 7 15.1 (b)</p> <p>Substantive</p> <p>This paragraph establishes the timeline by which the Central Services must make available the information on services/goods for purchase, yet nowhere in the regulation does it require the schools to notify Central Services of their intent to purchase from the District or not to do so.</p> <p>In theory, Central Services will be entering into at least a year-long contract with schools when they purchase services and like any other provider, we'll need notice to ensure we have proper quantity and quality of service for the demand. The Central Services will be far too lean to carry an excessive amount of unneeded capacity, so whether it is here, or in our procedures, we need to bound the customer's time to deliberate.</p> <p>Ensure a proper timeline is established that allows the Central Services enterprise to adjust to shifting demands.</p>	<p>26 7 15.2</p> <p>Add "In the event of a financial hardship, this subsection will be implemented subject to the Superintendent's discretion."</p>	<p>27 15.2</p> <p>"restricted"</p> <p>Clarify or add a definition in the terms section.</p> <p>Carry forward cannot be provided by January 15. This is related to year end and not known until 30 days after year end. Jan 15 is in the middle of a school year and schools are not finished spending for the current year. Additionally, this date is problematic every other year due to Legislative session and the fact that additional DSA and categorical funds are not known until late May or in some cases early June. As long as prior year numbers can be used this is workable.</p>	<p>28 7 16.1(a)</p> <p>Add "If the amounts are unknown, the funding allocation will be based on the previous year's budget."</p>	<p>29 7 16.1(b)</p> <p>"not less than 85 percent"</p> <p>Suggest change to 80% with 1% increases over 5 years up to 85%.</p> <p>85% may not be currently feasible with all the dictated central services in section 14.3.</p>
---	--	---	---	--	---

8/16/2016

30	8 17.1	Action recommended	Without the adequate allocations from the state and the inclusion of categorical funds from NDE such as Zoom and Victory, forcing CCSD to assign weights for ELL and FRL will result in a shift of resources from schools without holding harmless those from which dollars will be taken.
31	9 17.1(d)	"Gifted and talented pupils"	
32	9 17.3	Strike" (d) Gifted and talented pupils" Modify reference to Section 13 to "Section 13.3"	
33	9 17.3	Suggested Change	The third line of Sec 17.3 uses the language "specialty school or rural school" but the first line does not. Suggest aligning the language for consistency. This section does not account for significant reductions in enrollment. The phrase "proportionally larger" in line 4 is unclear and undefined. If the intent was to ensure that the per-pupil allocation remains constant, it is suggested that the language be amended to reflect that.
34	10 18.1	"pursuant to section 17 of this regulation." Add "The allocation may be revised upon final DSA per-pupil allocation receipt for the district."	
35	10 18.2	"report of the pupils attending each school for the previous calendar quarter pursuant to NRS 387.1223."	The previous calendar quarter report required by NRS 387.1223 does not include category of pupils.
36	10 18.2	"previous calendar quarter"	Modify to "first quarter of the current school year"
37	10 18.4	"must be adjusted at the end of the school year to reflect the actual number of pupils in each category who attended the local school precinct."	Modify to "must be adjusted at the end of the first quarter of the school year to reflect the number of pupils in each category who attended the local school precinct according to the report of the pupils enrolled in each school for the first quarter pursuant to NRS 387.1223."
38	11 19		Costs may arise to re-program how the District is able to budget and provide this information.
39	11 19.1(c)		This would require school assistance to complete.

40	11	19.2		CCSD currently has dashboard limitations that would have additional costs to upgrade (not yet quantified) to enable this to be accomplished. This would also be a process change which staff in budget and the strategic budget team are currently working on and have not completely reconciled between the school budgets and Final Budget 2016-2017. Starting this plan in 2018 would provide time to work through these issues.
41	11	20		It is a innovative and untested procedure that forces a government entity to have its employees interviewed by other government entities and the public. There are employment and labor law questions raised by this plan. For example, the outside government entity will be liable for its own torts and/or constitutional violations of civil rights, privacy, defamation, etc. Interviewers may state discriminatory remarks or questions that may create a cause of action for the employee. Should the local government entity indemnify the District for the actions or inactions at its public meetings? Current employees have procedural due process under District regulations and the CBA. How do these interact with this regulation? NRS 288 allows a CBA to trump the statute. Does that apply to his regulation as well? While this is seemingly intended to create a bonding between the employee and the local government entity, does that interfere with the loyalty of the employee to the students? The novelty of this process creates a higher risk for litigation.
42	11	20.2	Substantive "...At least one representative of the principals..."	Recommend replacing "of the" with "...selected by and from among the group of principals..."
43	13	21.1(d)	Substantive "Provide a report, in person, at least quarterly..."	Modify to "Provide a quarterly report."

Suggest adding language to match the intent to specify that the representative be one of the principals from the local school precincts supervised by the vacant SAS.

44 13 21.1(d)	"Provide a report, in person, at least quarterly to the governing..."	One purpose of this regulation was touted as removing supervisory layers and allowing the schools to run themselves (with the team). This creates a new layer of bureaucracy except that where the current supervisors are educators and professionals, this new layer of outside supervisors is not.
45 13 21.1(d)	"Provide a report, in person, at least quarterly to the governing..."	If SAS have schools in multiple jurisdictions, even just one school in their portfolio that is with a single local body, attending multiple quarterly meetings could be time consuming and potentially not beneficial. Since this plan relies 100% on SAS to supervise principals, spending so much time out of schools could negatively impact compliance.
46 13 21.2	Add "(c) Progress of the local school precinct in implementing the plan of operation."	
47 14 23	Add Subsection 5: "The principals of the local school precinct must be accountable for all aspects of the performance of the local school precinct. As used in this subsection, "performance" means the overall operation of the local school precinct as measured by: (a) The satisfaction of parents and guardians of pupils and teachers, administrators and other staff of the local school precinct as determined by the surveys administered pursuant to section 31 of this regulation; (b) The progress made by the local school precinct to satisfy the goals and objectives set forth in the statewide system of accountability for public schools; and (c) Progress of the local school precinct in implementing the plan of operation."	

10:01:20 a.m. 08-16-2016

48	15	25.1	Action recommended	Sec 25.1.a - 25.1.e- Based on this new language, there are only two possible SOT configurations mathematically possible: 2 teachers, 1 support staff, 1 student, and 4 parents OR 4 teachers, 1 support staff, 1 student, and 6 parents	There remain challenges with this language. With only about 50% of teachers and support staff being union members, if no union member seeks election at a school, or an insufficient number of union members seek election, there will need to be clarification on how to proceed. Also, if a union member must be elected, they can receive no or very few votes and take the place of someone else who received a large number of votes. Additionally, professional educators are now only 50% of the composition of the team. Support staff have objected to only one member being on the team. Recommend consideration of increasing the number to two.
49	23	32.1	"On or before July 1 of each year"	"On or before October 1 of each year, to the extent the information is available,"	Achievement data is not available by July 1.
50	23	32.2		Add (c) The Board of Trustees	
51	24	33	Critical	The entire section speaks to costs incurred in the implementation of the plan being covered by the redistribution of existing funds. Replace section 33 with "The legislature shall appropriate funds to implement this plan."	This section presumes there was an excess of funds that are available to cover these costs. However, the District submits a balanced budget every year. The implementation timeline should be considered to allow the District to budget properly and avoid financial missteps caused by this plan.
52			not used		
53	24	34		"...any information requested..."	This assumes all requested information is available. While enormous amounts of data exist, requests for information from the Legislature do occur that cannot be fulfilled on occasion. Also, any new format requested will put a burden on the district and increase costs. It is possible that the Advisory Committee may change the format of the information with each request, stressing our already limited resources.

8/16/2016

<p>54 24 34.1</p> <p>Please define financial information that will be requested.</p> <p>The District must ensure that accounting and budget reporting will not be duplicious just simply in a different format. Accounting reports according to GAAP and budget reports according to Department of Taxation forms and 387 format. This requirement would add yet another format dictated by AB 394. All reflect additional burden on limited resources.</p>	
<p>55 24 34.2</p> <p>Clarify expectations for delivery of requested information.</p> <p>If information is to be posted online, existing tools are limited and would require an upgrade with a cost. As part of the existing budget process, budget staff do salary projections on all staff in positions as of typically January prior to the fiscal year that begins in July while vacant positions are budgeted for licensed teachers at average new teaching salary with other vacancies budgeted at average of like positions. These files are very large data files. Would need to be put into a different format by school. This information is provided annually to transparent Nevada, just not in a school by school format but rather in a District format. By job function what does that mean? Licensed, support, admin? If so, not an issue but if means down to the number licensed teachers in math by school would have the data limitation.</p>	
<p>56 24 34.2(b)</p> <p>All items listed in this section are currently available on Open Book via the existing dashboard except settlements and risk management, which are available in other reports. This information is included in the State Budget Forms as an Internal Service Fund.</p>	
<p>57 25 34.2(c)</p> <p>All items are already available on open book, except the specific salaries (by individual) of the Board of Trustees.</p>	
<p>58 25 34.2(d)</p> <p>This information is not available on open book currently in a dashboard but is available in a graph format Dept. of Taxation State Budget Forms.</p>	

ADDENDUM
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
EDWARD A. GREER EDUCATION CENTER, BOARD ROOM
2832 E. FLAMINGO ROAD, LAS VEGAS, NV 89121
THURSDAY, AUGUST 11, 2016
4:00 P.M.

ADDENDUM

Note: In conformance with the Open Meeting Law, it is hereby noted that the agenda for the meeting of the Clark County School District Board of Trustees has been posted at the following locations:

Boulder City Library	Moapa Valley Library
Green Valley Library	Mount Charleston Library
Indian Springs Library	North Las Vegas Library
Laughlin Library	Sandy Valley Library
Mesquite Library	Sandy Valley Middle School
Moapa Town Library	West Charleston Library
Moapa Valley High School Library	West Las Vegas Library
Edward A. Greer Education Center	Whitney Library
Clark County School District Administrative Center	
Clark County School District Web Site – www.ccsd.net	
Nevada Public Notice Web Site – http://notice.nv.gov	

Members of the public requiring special assistance or accommodations at the meeting, including translators for Spanish and other languages, are requested to contact the Office of the Board of Trustees at (702) 799-1072, at least 24 hours in advance.

6. BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES

- 6.01 ASSEMBLY BILL 394. Discussion and possible action by the Board of School Trustees on issues related to the plan to reorganize the Clark County School District and draft regulations by the Advisory Committee to Reorganize the Clark County School District, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)**
[Contact Persons: Chris Garvey and Pat Skorkowsky] (Ref. 6.01)
(According to Governance Policy GP-3: Board Responsibilities)

I make a motion that, the Board's position, as stated at the August 3, 2016 meeting, remain.

Today, we have been provided the latest version of the draft regulation from the Legislative Committee to Reorganize the Clark County School District. This regulation has not resolved our concerns regarding student achievement, equitable funding issues, student equity concerns, financial and employment issues and our concern that there be no substantial disruption to student education and achievement.

THEREFORE: Be it resolved the Board expresses the following examples of concerns with the Legislative Committee's proposed regulation.

As it relates to student achievement - we have concerns that the regulation lacks focus on student achievement, which is a primary strategic imperative of this Board;

As it relates to student equity - we have concerns about how equity will be maintained in student assignment, school attendance boundaries, school siting, increasing seats at individual schools as well as the lack of systemic checks and balances to ensure that all students will have equitable access to high quality programs including advanced placement;

As it relates to employment issues - we have concerns that equipment, services and supplies may be obtained from sources other than school employees and how other government entities will be involved in the interviewing and selection of District employees;

As it relates to student funding - we have concerns that it requires the District to develop a weighted student funding formula before the State Department of Education provides its guidance and without adequate funding to pay for these needs;

The Board will continue to voice these and other concerns in order to ensure that the regulation improves education for all students in the CCSD.

**Agenda Item Details**

Meeting Aug 03, 2016 - Work Session
Category 4. BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
Subject 4.01 ASSEMBLY BILL 394.
Type Regular (Action), Discussion

Discussion by the Clark County School District Board of School Trustees on issues related to the Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District and Draft Regulations for Proposal to the State Board of Education by the Advisory Committee to Develop a Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District (AB 394) and possible action by the Board of Trustees on a formal Board position on the Plan to Reorganize the Clark County School District and Draft Regulations for Proposal to the State Board of Education, is recommended. **(For Possible Action)** [Contact Person: Linda E. Young] (Ref. 4.01) *(According to Governance Policy GP-3: Board Responsibilities)*

08.03.16 Three questions and motion documents .pdf (404 KB) 08.03.16 Ref. 4.01(cont).mp3 (20,995 KB)

08.03.16 Ref. 4.01.mp3 (34,767 KB) 08.03.16 Ref. 4.01.pdf (17,216 KB)

**THREE MAIN QUESTIONS FROM TRUSTEES REGARDING AB 394
REORGANIZATION OF THE CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

1. In light of the plan proposal's shift of authority and responsibility, and its governing body and toward individual school management teams, who has legal responsibility for damages and the duty to remedy if it is determined that, as a result of the plan, a student's civil rights or other federal education law is violated?
2. How does the scope of AB 394 authorize the transfer of responsibilities proposed in the plan, such as preparation and approval of budgets, administration of collective bargaining requirements on personnel, purchasing of services and products, etc.?
3. Do the draft regulations of the AB 394 Reorganization Plan of the CCSD exceed the legal authority provided in existing law, e.g., the transfer of duties and responsibilities of elected officials to individuals who serve at the discretion of those elected officials?

Examples of additional questions include:

I make a motion that, based on the Board discussion of the proposed AB 394 plan and the questions raised during the discussion regarding the proposed plan, that it is the position of the Board that there are significant educational, financial and legal issues that must be addressed prior to the proposed plan being finalized and implemented. And be it further resolved that the Board's paramount concerns are for the improvement of achievement for all students in the CCSD and in equity and access to a high quality education for all CCSD students, therefore, there must be assurances that the proposed plan will not result in substantial disruption to students within the district.